DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 318 078 EA 021 557

AUTHOR Wildman, Louis
TITLE Where Will LEAD Lead?
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 33p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; Assessment Centers (Personnel); College School Cooperation; Educational Administration; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; Higher Education; Institutional Cooperation; Interviews; *Leadership Training; *Management Development; *Principals; *Program Evaluation; Research Problems
IDENTIFIERS *Leadership Educ Administration Development

ABSTRACT

After setting forth eight assumptions concerning the education of educational administrators, findings about the Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) program are discussed. The analysis is based on the first-year applications, telephone conversations with staff at a majority of the project sites, and additional material provided by individual project directors. LEAD projects exhibit the following characteristics: (1) approximately 65 percent of LEAD programs emphasize training in the effective schools/teaching approach; (2) in approximately 60 percent of the programs there is no provision for research in educational administration; (3) approximately 30 percent of the LEAD centers include or are directly associated with administrator assessment centers; and (4) in some states there are signs that coordination of administrative development may become a closed loop of recruitment, training, assessment, selection, and inservice. Positive features of the programs include closer working relationships among school districts, universities, and state education agencies; and helping citizens understand the educational role of administrators. The analysis concludes that, if the LEAD program is continued, funding should be so constructed as to strengthen the research-teaching-service link between schools and colleges of education. Appended are 88 notes and 6 educational "analogies" to a cited study on industrial productivity. (MLF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Louis Wildman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED318078

Where will LEAD lead?

Louis Wildman
California State University--Bakersfield

According to Bruce Hunter, lobbyist for the American Association of School Administrators, this is the way the Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) program was born:

> It all happened one night at 3 a.m.
>
> It was the strangest day of my life as a lobbyist.
>
> Sen. Chafee and Rep. Petri were impressed by the effective schools research. There was a fellow there from Rochester, New York. Our intended assumption was that the best training does not take place in any one setting.
>
> We sat down, wacked out a bill, and took it to them.
>
> We didn't get any democratic support.
>
> Bills had passed the House and Senate. In conference a staff member wanted to add something that wasn't in either of the original bills:" an institute for the University of Indiana. When that got added, so did the "Talented Teacher Act," and so did "LEAD for school administrators."
>
> School administrators will have to deal with merit pay and a host of other new responsibilities. They need this training.
>
> It was one of the most wonderful nights of my lobbying life![1]

Now in its second year, $14.3 million in federal funds have been spent on this major initiative. Hence it is appropriate to ask, "Where will LEAD lead?"

Inevitably programatic studies such as this are based upon an author's implicit or explicit assumptions. Since several assumptions have clearly motivated my work, I have chosen to make my assumptions explicit by first summarizing my perspective and then discussing my findings, in light of that perspective. The documentation for this work is based upon LEAD applications and publications, as well as upon written correspondence and telephone conversations with LEAD officials at the U.S. Department of Education and at LEAD projects located in every state and the District of Columbia.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA021557

My Perspective

I started my review of funded LEAD applications with the following perspective:

1. I make a distinction between "training" and "education."

Education facilitates the exercise of professional judgement, based upon careful analysis and evaluation of situations that are not routine. Training teaches an employee to follow narrowly defined procedures. A circus trainer "trains" animals to respond to very specific cues so that the lion tamer doesn't get his head bitten off! The army "trains" soldiers to respond on command. Would you rather hire a "trained" employee or an "educated" employee? It depends upon whether you want that employee to follow commands or exercise professional judgement.

2. I believe that the liberal arts provide the best knowledge base for the education of educational administrators.

In 1966 Robert Hutchins gave a speech at the dedication of the Rutgers University Law School in which he spoke about the need for a place to study law in the mainstream of the humanistic tradition. He said that the study of law should be shaken out of its "how-to-do-it" training mold. A "how-to-do-it" training institution is one that aims to produce technicians, whereas an educational program based upon the liberal arts for educational leaders would examine the nature of knowledge, the purposes of education, the means of transmitting and expanding knowledge, the relationship of education to politics, economics, and social justice, while addressing administrator organizational, supervisory, and instructional competence.

Similarly in 1983 Derek Bok, the President of Harvard University, described a plan for transforming the educational methodology and curriculum of the medical school at Harvard. That plan, in reaction to the narrow training and frantic memorization typical of medical education throughout the country, included developments which would provide physicians with a much broader education.[2]

What may be surprising to some is the extent to which business is providing its corporate managers with continuing education in the liberal arts. While earlier corporate management training programs emphasized proven techniques and effective skills, much top corporate management now realizes that contemporary leaders must understand the broader issues of the corporate environment. Thus, Hallmark arranges for a select set of managers to participate in an annual "Hallmark Executive Seminar in the Humanities," organized and hosted by the University of Kansas.

Williams College and Dartmouth College both offer corporate managers programs in the liberal arts. The Williams College Executive Program was started by A.T. & T. for its most promising executives. For a fee of over $6,000 participant future corporate leaders engage in courses centering around books such as The Federalist Papers, Max Weber's The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, John Stuart Mill's On Liberty, and Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War. The Washington and Lee, and the Wabash College Executive Programs in the liberal arts are explicitly designed to facilitate the transition to higher level, more responsible leadership positions. The executive seminars of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies have more than five thousand alumni from the nation's major firms.[3]

In his book, The Best and the Brightest,[4] David Halberstam warned that operational brilliance leads to pride and blindness. He portrays a presidential cabinet of skilled technicians without the humility of a responsible liberal education, who were quick to put their theories into practice but slow to recognize and remedy their theories' deficiencies. These skilled technicians had technique that tended to exercise a magnetic influence on policy, drawing policy after it. Thus these trained technicians influenced policy makers to grab onto concrete operational means rather than carefully examine a historical, cultural, and political situation quite different from popular impressions.

We in educational administration should be most sensitive to the dangers of narrow training and simplistic solutions.

3. I believe that leadership is not equivalent to the simplistic application of practical advice.

As James MacGregor Burns said in his classic book, Leadership:

> There is a false conception of a leader as someone who gives commands, controls a situation, or merely exerts power over others. Properly conceived, leadership is a process of mobilizing the human needs, resources, and aspirations of followers."[5]

> Machiavelli's practical advice was not at all practical.[6] Machiavelli has had countless imitators. The vogue of the "how to" manual still thrives today: How to gain power. How to influence people. How to win office. How to take over an organization. How to organize a people's movement. Most of these guides are promoted as being wholly practical . . . Situation-specific, they are directed so intensively at concrete circumstances that they may positively handicap persons who wish to advance beyond those circumstances.
>
> The main feature of these manuals is more pernicious. While few of them today emulate the master in offering Machiavellian advice on how to coerce, control, or deceive other persons, many do seek to train persons to manage and manipulate other persons rather than to lead them. The technique is usually that of the marketplace manipulation: to play on low-order wants and needs and to create hopes and aspirations where none existed before. . . Worse, the manuals treat persons as things, as tools to be used . . .[7]

> Can leadership be taught? . . . Ultimately education and leadership shade into each other to become almost inseparable, but only when both are defined as the reciprocal raising of levels of motivation rather than indoctrination or coercion.[8]

4. I believe that professional education is best conducted in an active research environment.

As Derek Bok, President of Harvard University, has pointed out, law schools are not themselves active research environments, despite their emphasis upon Socratic reasoning and critical analyses of court opinions. They have chosen to rely upon practicing lawyers as faculty to teach current practice.

> As a result, our understanding of how the legal system actually works and what effects it has on those it purports to serve has not advanced nearly as much as it might have done if law schools had chosen to recruit more Ph.D.'s to their faculties.[9]

The life of the student at all levels should involve investigation, not just the acquisition of prepared knowledge. Similarly the life of schools and universities should embody the characteristics of learning communities within which it is clear that new issues are constantly emerging and old questions never answered with finality. Research grows out of a continuing effort to improve educational practice. It should be noted that this perspective is quite different from the opinion that effective teaching includes certain specific characteristics. Instead, this perspective conceives of teaching as encompassing an instructional process that is continuously being improved by reflective "researcher" teachers through experiential feedback. Research and teaching are thus essentially inseparable.

5. I hope that we will become a learning society.

University research is increasingly the source of new products. Corporations increasingly seek university faculty as consultants in order to improve the competitive position of their products. Increasingly adults are returning to school, and school facilities are increasingly being utilized for recreational as well as educational purposes. America is realizing that our democratic system depends upon an educated citizenry, and that our economic prosperity depends upon increasing our dedication to public education in the future.[10]

6. School districts and universities need to develop closer ties.

School districts are the testing ground for ideas in educational administration. Unfortunately, school staffs often resent education professors, just as the Sophists resented Socrates. However, as more schools become learning communities which engage continuously in self-examination, evaluation and reflection, the research and service orientation of university faculty hopefully will be viewed as consistent with the purposes of elementary and secondary school faculty.

Having argued for closer collaboration, this is not to say that university faculty should parrot current administrative views. As Robert Hoffert suggested,

> The challenge today is not to make education less theoretical but to make it more theoretically mature. Honest and rigorous theoretical studies not only identify higher standards but develop a keen sense of the limits, pitfalls, and adjustments that are an integral part of any search for practical and ethical progress.[11]

Universities exist partially to act as Socratic gadflies. Further, when they educate teachers and educational administrators, ideally they do so not only for the schools of the present, but also for the schools of the future. Thus the choice of a field site for student teaching is problematic: If the student teacher is placed in a classroom which does not incorporate methodology consistent with the student's education courses based upon the latest research, the student is likely to set aside this recent learning and learn to teach in a manner of some earlier time. On the other hand, if the student teacher is placed in a lab school which consistently incorporates the latest practices, the teacher may have considerable difficulty when hired in a school which still uses older methods. The same problem exists in the placement of administrative interns. However this is the reason why interns should be simultaneously enrolled in an analytic seminar. This seminar should require students to interpret their field experiences--whatever their nature--in light of their university studies and the older methods which they may still encounter.

7. <u>I believe schools have two fundamental purposes: to develop individual talent and to enculturate.</u>

There is a fundamental antinomy in social psychology between openness to change and the desire to preserve a pre-existing view or conviction.[12] There is a similar "duality" in education. On the one hand we want to help students to develop their individual talents surpassing our accomplishments, while on the other hand we want to pass on to the next generation what we know. Both purposes of education are important.

Tutorials and seminars provide faculty the context within which to facilitate, aid, and assist individual student development. The enculturation side of education can be specified in terms of specific objectives, and will be increasingly systematically taught utilizing educational technology.

Over the next two decades we will see enormous pressures to improve educational efficiency. If the public, and particularly educators, do not understand this duality, the teacher time saved through application of the technology will not be given over to "investigatory" work with individual students. Teachers will lose their jobs like musicians in the pit orchestras during the silent motion picture days lost theirs with the advent of movies with sound. And we will lose an opportunity to transform schools into learning community centers.

8. I believe that the "effective schools" research has been interpretted much too simplistically as a prescription for excellence.

In Search of Excellence[13] provided business managers with eight commandments of excellent corporations. However, within four years business realities changed, and, as Business Week[14] pointed out, some of the companies cited for their excellence were excellent no longer. How did the authors respond? Robert Waterman said that "The book has been so popular that people have taken it as a formula for success rather than what it was intended to be. We were writing about the art, not the science, of management." While Roger Smith, CEO at General Motors has made this same point, many educators have not recognized a similar problem with the "effective school" research findings.[15] It has proven difficult to show lasting results. Furthermore, achievement test score gains only attempt to measure the enculturation side of education.

Applying the methods used in "effective schools" may not be the best way to bring about "effectiveness" in less successful institutions. It is unlikely that the characteristics of effective schools can be artificially "painted on;" it is more probable that they must grow out of the essential character of the institution.

Experimental design and statistical problems in the effective school research have been difficult to overcome. After all, correlation does not demonstrate causation. Furthermore, in reality there probably is not "one best method" of teaching or of administering schools.

At the application level, what does the effective school characteristic "strong administrative leadership" mean? As Martin Burlingame asks, does it mean strong top-down leadership, strong representation of local community values, or strong bottom-up leadership?[16] Similarly, when "the effective principal sets high expectations," how high should they be? It seems to me that we in educational administration should agree with Robert Waterman and Roger Smith. When they talk about corporate leadership, they admit that they are discussing the "art of management."

The LEAD Grant and Departments of Educational Administration

Starting with the forgoing perspective, I attempted to examine the federal LEAD program. The LEAD grant announcement was consistent with the view of AASA lobbyist Bruce Hunter that "the best training does not take place in any one setting."[17] Despite the fact that the LEAD grant availability announcement strongly criticized college and university preservice preparation programs for administrators ("Much of this training is widely believed to be out of touch with reality--irrelevant, out of date, abstract, and impractical."[18]) the formentioned decision was made, not to try to improve those programs, but to encourage local educational agencies, intermediate school districts, state educational agencies, non-profit organizations, and private management organizations, as well as institutions of higher education, to apply for grants.[19]

At an "information conference" held Oct. 28, 1986 for prospective grant applicants, each LEAD project applicant was told to form an advisory committee. Applicants were encouraged to include members from "schools of business, schools of public administration, schools/departments/colleges of education, and from the administrator ranks, including elementary and secondary principals and superintendents."[20]

The discussion also covered the "peer review process for evaluating LEAD applications."[21] "Peers" included "scholars from many disciplines, school administrators from both local and state levels, teachers, business officials, and community leaders."[22]
The lack of a leadership role for professors of educational administration was apparent at each of these steps.

By the spring of 1987, 51 projects were funded--one in each state and the District of Columbia. Congress appropriated $7,175,547 for the LEAD centers, and has appropriated the same amount for the second year of their operation. This has amounted to approximately $127,400 in federal funding per year for each of these LEAD Centers.

Difficulty Obtaining Information From U.S. Department of Education

In September of 1987 I attempted to obtain copies of the funded LEAD project applications from the U.S. Department of Education. Surprisingly, copies of these documents were not made readily available for a duplicating and service fee. Instead I had to utilize the "Freedom of Information Act" to obtain the copies, which I did later in September 1987, finally obtaining some of the documentation for this research in January of 1988.

After paying a $375 duplicating fee, unfortunately I still was unable to obtain important portions of these applications. As of August 1988, after repeated requests and appeals citing the "Freedom of Information Act," I was still unable to obtain copies of LEAD project budgets to determine the source of matching funds. Project directors that I later spoke with said that most of the matching funds for their LEAD centers have come from in-kind sources. However, due to the unwillingness of the U.S. Department of Education to provide copies of these budgets, I have been unable to directly determine where the $14.3 million in federal money has gone. I was not reassured when Hunter Moorman, LEAD program manager in the U.S. Department of Education, told me that the LEAD program would be audited by officials in the Defense Department![23]

Furthermore, I was unable to obtain complete copies of the narrative portions of the applications. While there may be "privacy reasons" for excluding resumes of project staff, I was appalled by the Department's refusal to grant access to numerous appendices, required federal cover sheets (Form 424), and bibliographies, mentioned in other portions of the provided applications.

One further limitation, however, must be mentioned. Apparently more than a few of the LEAD project plans were changed after being selected. I was unable to determine the extent to which this has occurred, though Hunter Moorman told me that many were "substantially changed." While it is obviously necessary for Education Department officials to have the authority to exercise some flexibility in working with grantees, if substantial changes have been allowed, this raises questions about the propriety of the original application process. Some applicants who did not promise so much may have lost in the application process to those who promised much but have since not delivered.[24]

Nevertheless, the analysis which follows is based upon the first year applications, telephone conversations with staff at a majority of the project sites, and additional material kindly provided by individual project directors.

Training vs. Education

We begin by examining the extent to which LEAD projects emphasize "training" vs. "education." With a few notable exceptions, LEAD projects emphasize training.[25]

For example, the South Carolina LEAD program is heavily "training" oriented. After acknowledging that current programs in educational administration include formal instruction "in educational organization and administration, curriculum, supervision, finance, school law, research, educational psychology, history and philosophy of education, the school plant, and personnel management"[26] and acknowledging that some programs integrate social and behavioral science research findings and a few use materials from the humanities, the South Carolina grant criticizes current programs, saying that the experiences are fairly limited[27] and the courses are "not aligned with desired outcomes."[28] A South Carolina LEAD program goal is that their "PET trained principals will demonstrate improved instructional observation, analysis, conferencing, and coaching skills."[29]

The intentions of the Georgia LEAD program are likewise typical, "Administrators in the state are to be trained extensively . . . "[30] However, some of the programs go still further, emphasizing training with a certainty and self-assuredness that resembles corporate sales propaganda. For example, the New Jersey application states that "the target population for the . . . LEAD Consortium includes: graduate students, educational administrators, . . . [and] school districts which join in a partnership with busine.. to use corporate trainers, techniques and facilities to inculcate a sound management culture . . . "[31] California's LEAD application proclaims, ". . . we know the types of training experiences which must replace outdated practices. Research speaks convincingly to the content and skills that must be taught, and the forms of training which are most effective."[32] "Specialized training for trainers cycles will be offered to professors. Universities and/or individual professors who choose to revise course content will also have access to technical assistance from LEAD staff."[33]

Hawaii has a curiously contradictory perspective toward training. While they admit that "No preservice training program, in itself, can hope to establish among its participants a set of skills so comprehensive as to yield the individual administrator effective under all of the diverse circumstances in which teaching and learning is to occur,"[34] they seek to remedy this problem with even more specific training.

This emphasis upon training is curious in view of their own description of the students that administrators in Hawaii serve:

> [In today's schools there is]. . . the increased presence of students, their parents and even staff members from a wide variety of cultural backgrounds. In the State of Hawaii a situation exists where no single ethnic/cultural group makes up a majority of the population. Additionally, ongoing immigration patterns indicate that significant numbers of people from other nations are being served by the schools. Taken in total, the administrators of Hawaii's schools are faced with operating in a highly diverse cultural setting, requiring a sophisticated level of interpersonal competence.[35]

The need which Hawaiian educational administrators have for a broad education in these diverse cultures is quickly apparent. It would seem that administrative training apart from a study of the arts, sociology and cultural anthropology would be disfunctional.

School administrators in many isolated areas are called upon to function as community leaders with far broader responsibilities than administering a school. Here too, school leaders need a far broader education than mere training in specific "skills," yet most LEAD programs (e.g. Alaska[36]), while recognizing these broader responsibilities, still seem to emphasize training.

The LEAD projects in New York and Pennsylvania should be cited for distinguishing between "training" and "education." Pennsylvania's proposal specifically states that

> . . . there are areas of specialized knowledge in which all educational leaders need rigorous preparation. These areas include child development, organizational structuring and management of school and human resources, the application of research findings to the creation and enhancement of school environments that promote learning and student achievement, techniques for evaluating school curricula in order to assess and improve effectiveness, and anlysis of instruction and staff performance."[37]

The Pennsylvania LEAD application unequivically states that ". . . leadership training for principals must contain certain knowledge components rather than being simply skills oriented."[38]

New York's LEAD project stresses professional empowerment. New York LEAD planners state that "It may be viewed as 'splitting hairs' but what is needed is not so much training as an educative process."[39] But in the New York program this distinction is not just "splitting hairs." They have emphasized a self-educating process, unique among LEAD projects. They recognize the value of developing learning communities. This is what was concluded after a 5 day seminar on teacher evaluation:

> What was concluded as a result of both Seminars I and II was that the process of conducting the deliberations was just as important as the reports that were generated. It was concluded that the processes that led to the seminars and the rubric of professional respect under which they were conducted are, themselves, preconditions to the development of good evaluation policy and for that matter any school building related policy."[40]

They are practicing respect for each other as professionals. This is the opposite of "training."

Effective Schools/Teaching/Business Emphasis

Unfortunately the New York program is virtually unique in its intent to build on professional colleagiality. The majority--approximately 65%--of LEAD programs emphasize training in the effective schools/teaching approach.

Idaho's LEAD program is typical in that "Training needs identified by practicing administrators will be delivered within a framework established by research on effective schools."[41] Given the interest of Senators Chafee and Petri in the effective schools research, perhaps it is surprising that the percentage is not larger. While the Delaware LEAD project, for example, is closely allied with the effective teaching/schools/business approach,[42] the Pennsylvania LEAD project, associated with Temple University, admits the limitations of this work:

> Findings from the past two decades of research on effective teaching and school effectiveness provide the basis for the design of the proposed approach to educational leadership development.[43]

However,

> The extant research base does not provide a good understanding of how the characteristic features of effective school programs are operationalized at specific sites, how they interact, and how they work to produce desired outcomes."[44]

> . . . there are [many] areas of specialized knowledge in which all educational leaders need rigorous preparation. These areas include child development, organizational structuring and management of school and human resources . . . [45]

> . . . leadership training for principals must contain certain knowledge components rather than being simply skills oriented.[46]

One of the goals of the Pennsylvania LEAD project is to link school improvement with administrator development.

> Thus, the proposed work can be characterized as providing a systematic mechanism whereby educational leaders are able to develop school management and instructional skills in instituting school improvement programs that are based on findings from the first generation of research on effective teaching and school effectiveness. As a result, it is anticipated that a new research base will be accumulated on how to operationalize the effectiveness research and, thereby, build a "second generation" of research that focuses on a description and analysis of implementation processes that lead to school improvement.[47]

Other LEAD programs are also moving beyond the effective schools approach. For example, in Missouri a series of three two-day sessions on effective schools research and practices at eight state university locations attempted to establish a common language among school leaders. At the same time,

> The effective schools research and practices are not presented as a narrow, rigid model to be copied or as an answer to all educational problems. Nor are they projected as all encompassing or as the pathway to excellence.[48]

The Connecticut LEAD application states that "Leadership development should avoid being linked to any one school of leadership theory or practice."[49] Likewise the South Dakota LEAD application explains that:

> The latest approaches to administrative preservice and inservice training have been to base the training on the interpretation of research findings on the functions of successful school leaders and practices in the use of leadership skills while at the same time searching for the most critical skills to teach to school leaders. This search is endless because there has been no single theory of leadership found that explains all leadership situations or performance, just as there has not been any single set of administrative skills found that will aid school leaders in solving all the critical problems that they face . . . [50]

As the Rhode Island LEAD application states:

> The literature contains descriptions of success stories, but most are just not generalizable to the majority of administrators. Indeed, stories of superhuman efforts to excel not only are poor guides to improving standard practice, they impede attention to systemic problems by deluding observers into believing that much can be accomplished by most within the constraints of the existing system. This is not so.[51]

In sum, a majority of the LEAD projects have intended to implement the "effective schools" approach, but at least 35% are either utilizing other approaches or attempting to move beyond the effective schools model. For example the Washington, D.C. LEAD project emphasizes strategic planning and Michigan's LEAD project is based upon the leadership interview findings of Bennis and Nanus.[52]

Commendably, Florida's LEAD project encourages and expects "Technical Assistance Leadership Teams to develop a philosophy of technical assistance that stresses the consultant's responsibility to develop the client's capactiy to solve its own problems and to maintain those solutions independent of the consultant."[53]

This capacity to solve one's own problems is essentially a "research capacity." The problem envisioned as more of the LEAD programs move beyond the effective schools "answers" is that a majority of the LEAD programs have not anticipated a need to upgrade their own programs through a healthy mix of research and teaching.

Research and Teaching

In approximately 60% of the LEAD programs there is no provision for research in educational administration to improve offerings and contribute to the knowledge base upon which all can draw.[54] However, an ideal relationship between teaching and research is set forth in the LEAD program in Louisiana:

> The use of higher education institutions as the hub of this leadership development system makes sense in a number of ways. First, this system for the preparation of school administrators is already in place. There is little need for more bricks and mortar, research capacity, initial expertise, and investment in central logistical concerns. Second, the system has a track record in preparing school administrators and in providing technical assistance. New and more rigorous certification requirements for school administrators have been implemented over the past few years and a new corps of leadership is presently "waiting in the wings" for their first

> principalship. Higher education has a stake in these people and their success in schools. LEAD provides the missing component. . . to help them develop into instructional leaders while new principals on the job. Third, field-based assessment and . . . program evaluation . . . should provide higher education substantial data that can be used to make revisions in graduate programs for school administrator certification and to develop stronger linkages between higher education and the field. Fourth, new school administrators and faculty in educational administration have an already established mentoring relationship by virtue of their studies to gain certification and Louisiana LEAD merely builds on this relationship.[55]

To those of us in higher education who believe in this ideal integral relationship between research and teaching, a lack of a research component among LEAD programs is a sign of future stagnation. Given that situation, LEAD training and principal assessment centers--many partially funded by LEAD--show signs of becoming a way to maintain, select, and initiate "administrator members." Certainly the research foundation for the LEAD assessment centers raises many questions.

LEAD Assessment Centers

Approximately 30% of the LEAD centers include or are directly associated with administrator assessment centers. And most LEAD centers assessing prospective administrators for certification or selection purposes utilize the National Association of Secondary School Principals' (NASSP) assessment model. This assessment instrument is the result of $294,000 in grants from the Danforth, Rockefeller Family, and Spencer Foundations. According to a NASSP brochure, use of this model "has almost doubled each year for the last three years. Next year we anticipate having a center available for use by school districts in most states."[56]
By 1986, thirteen states had adopted examination procedures for certification of administrators.[57]

The South Carolina law reads as follows:

> Beginning with the school year 1985-86, any person being considered for appointment as a principal for any elementary or secondary school must be assessed for his instructional leadership and management capabilities by the Assessment Center of South Carolina Department of Education and a written report of such assessment must be forwarded to the board of trustees of the district before such appointment is made. . . .[58]

According to this same NASSP brochure,[59] assessment centers were "first developed by the German military," and are now used in business. NASSP believes the information generated can be used "in answering personnel placement and development questions."

Somewhat confusing is the NASSP use of the term "assessment center." According to NASSP, "An assessment center is a process, not a location." Hence when the words are not capitalized in NASSP literature, "an assessment center" simply means "an assessment" or more specifically "an NASSP assessment procedure." Consistent with the LEAD emphasis upon training and exclusivity, it is interesting to note that NASSP assessment literature states that "all training is conducted by NASSP."

While NASSP claims that their assessment procedure is "a validated process," an examination of the documentation they provide,[60] based upon a study by researchers at Michigan State University, raises considerable concern.

For example, one might expect that there would be at least a moderate positive correlation between how well experienced educators felt they did after being assessed and the assessment procedure rating. In fact, "correlations of self-performance ratings with assessment center ratings are generally low."[61]

To examine the validity of the assessment procedure, researchers studied the correlation between the assessment test scores and ratings from an individual's immediate supervisor, two teachers, two support staff and the person him/herself. However, while the validation sample size tested was 425, unfortunately the reported correlations between on-the-job performance and assessment scores are based upon between 37 and 120 individuals. For example, the correlation between the support staff rating of the administrator's fiscal management and assessment procedure scores is based upon the rating and appraisal of 37 individuals, whereas the correlation between support staff rating of community relations and assessment procedure scores is based upon the rating and appraisal of 54 individuals. The correlation of overall on-the-job supervisor performance rating and assessment procedure scores is based upon data on 120 individuals.

While some significant relationships were found when comparing NASSP assessment skill dimension scores and supervisor ratings, it is not very comforting to find that there was only a .25 (n=120) correlation between supervisor ratings of performance and an overall "placement decision" based upon two days of testing evaluated by "supervisory type" appraisers. Similarly the correlation between teacher ratings of overall performance and a "placement recommendation" based upon the NASSP test was .30 (n=110), and the correlation between staff ratings of performance and a "placement recommendation" based upon the NASSP test was just .05 (n=109)!

Only four significant ($p<=.01$) relationships (out of 192) were found when comparing NASSP assessment skill dimension scores and teacher ratings. This later finding is particularly surprising in view of Prof. Richard Andrews' research[42] which has demonstrated a positive relationship between teacher perceptions of school climate and student achievement. Likewise only four significant ($p<=.01$) relationships (out of 192)--and not the same relationships--were found when comparing NASSP assessment skill dimension scores and staff ratings.

It should be noted that in evaluating so many correlations one should expect some to be significant by chance alone.

In addition to collecting performance ratings for each of the individuals involved in the validation effort, data was gathered to assess the school climate in which the administrators worked. Those involved in the NASSP assessment model study hoped to validate NASSP assessment scores by showing a relationship between an administrator's scores and climate assessment data in that setting.

Concern about the method used to establish the content validity of the NASSP assessment procedure follows from the explanation given in the documentation manual. NASSP literature stresses that "Assessors are trained to understand and internalize the meaning of each skill dimension."[43]

> In order to establish the content validity of the NASSP assessment center, "experts" were asked to examine and rate the assessment center exercises as to the extent they provided essential or helpful information about the assessment center skills. Those "experts" were 18 educators who have been principals or who have been very closely involved with the work of principals. These "experts" had also been trained and had served as assessors, so they were thoroughly familiar with the assessment center exercises.[44]

These 18 of NASSP's own assessors, after having been "trained" in the assessment procedure, judged the content validity as "good!"

The NASSP model includes 12 generic "skill" dimensions. The following four dimensions seem obvious: organizational ability, oral communication, judgement, and problem analysis. However dimensions such as "leadership" and "decisiveness" are not nearly so self-evident. What form of "leadership" is being recommended? Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership [45] discusses numerous kinds of leadership. James McGregor Burns' classic study[46] found that great leaders have utilized many differing leadership styles.

"Decisiveness" (the "decisiveness" of a baseball umpire?) is also a questionable skill. As a faculty and administrative staff learn to work together as professionals, respectful of eachother's professional expertise, "decisiveness" may not facilitate a collaborative colleagial relationship.

It will be recalled that this assessment procedure is actually being utilized in the job screening and selection process. Well meaning people are placing their trust in this assessment, and individual administrative careers are at stake. Unfortunately, the validity of this procedure is questionable. Nevertheless the NASSP validation study proclaims that "leadership, organizational ability, oral communications, decisiveness, judgement, and problem analysis are most highly correlated with job performance ratings."[47]

Most alarming is the conclusion that the dimensions: "range of interests, personal motivation, and educational values were generally not related to the performance dimensions" of a principal.[48] The suggestion that "personal motivation," "range of interests," and "education values" "may not be related to the job performance of the principals"[49] is tragic. That finding alone should have placed the validity of this procedure in question.

Organizational Cooperation

LEAD programs have not been without merit. The most positive aspect of this federal initiative has been the degree to which it has encouraged state departments of education, professional administrative associations, school districts, corporations and universities to work together. In virtually every state, efforts have been made in this direction.

For example, in Nebraska a consortium consisting of the Nebraska Council of School Administrators, the Educational Administration Department of Teachers College, University of Nebraska at Lincoln, the Nebraska State Department of Education, and the Nebraska State School Board Association was formed to advise the Nebraska LEAD program.

In Alaska, the LEAD program has motivated improved communication between the three universities, as well as with the professional associations. They began with the attitude: "If the university people are not willing to offer what we want, we will go elsewhere to get it and to get certified."[70] They criticized university people for not being willing to attend inservice sessions in school districts. But they have now gotten beyond these turf battles, recognized eachother's expertise, and started working toward the ideals of cooperation and colleagiality. Hence in June of 1988 university administrators, 19 superintendents, LEAD representatives, and administrative association officials gathered for a meeting to address common problems such as how they can help districts that are not working well with students.

Political Activity

While a positive result of these LEAD programs has been the closer working relationships that have been formed between professional associations, school districts, state education agencies, and universities, such coalitions have political implications which it is not yet possible to evaluate. For example, already in Minnesota we find that the LEAD program run by the St. Paul Public Schools has been justified on the basis of its political activity:

> Most education organizations testified vigorously against a mild structural change in Minnesota education at the 1986 legislative hearings. The change was to continue the one year program of giving high school juniors and seniors a choice of attending all or a part of the day at a post-secondary institution. Comments by educator organizations were to the effect that the program would be the death of public education; the program was skimming the best students; there was no need for the program; etc. Testimony by students and parents convinced legislators to continue the program. In fact, some legislators commented that the competition would be healthy for education and might cause school improvement if only educators made the effort to devise or expand programs and courses to retain students in high school. The St. Paul Public Schools was but one of two districts in the state to testify on behalf of the legislation. . . .
> These are factors that cause some hesitation about assigning the role of leadership training solely to traditional educational organizations. . . .
> Increasing the interaction of educator organizations with business training institutions and organizations may reduce the reluctance to consider new management styles and new ideas.[71]

Support for Beleaguered Administrators

It is an unfortunate fact that in many communities school administrators are constrained within a managerial role, not because of lack of training, but because of local expectations. Too often political forces combine in a cruel, irrational and disrespectful way to make educational leadership very difficult for dedicated experienced administrators. Where LEAD programs have helped citizens understand the educational role of administrators, they have performed an invaluable political service. For example, in Maine:

> A process for the local definition of administrator roles will allow school communities to decide which administrator functions have high local priority and to determine how those functions of lower priority will be eliminated or otherwise managed. Clarifying priority functions will allow administrators to reduce time now spent on administrivia and focus time and energy on behaviors that support school improvement. Clear local expectations for administrator roles will also serve to reduce the stress associated with jobs characterized by complexity, diversity and, too often, ambiguity. This is especially true in poor, geographically isolated regions where the number of administrators is typically small and one or two administrators are expected to be all things to all people. Greater clarity in role definition also serves to improve the hiring process by assuring that school boards know the skills that they are looking for in prospective administrators. It also allows candidates to assess whether or not there is a good fit between their skills/interests and a given school system. Finally, clear, locally agreed upon administrator roles will help build support for those roles in the community.[72]

Likewise the Missouri LEAD project has similar aims:

> The LEAD project will also aim to enhance the image of the school leader in the eye of the public as well as in [the] school leaders' own mind. The new image will include the role of school leaders as chief executives responsible for the achievement of the students in their charge, as models for continuous, life-long learning, and as calculated risk takers whose confidence in their abilities allows them to be advocates of quality instruction and overall school effectiveness and excellence.[73]

Recruitment/Training/Assessment/Selection/Inservice: A Closed Loop

One of the prime goals of many state LEAD programs is statewide "coordination" of administrative development. In some states there are signs that this coordination may become a closed loop of recruitment, training, assessment, selection and inservice. In Kansas, potential administrators are identified, recruited and recommended by practicing administrators for assessment by current administrators.[74] I have already described LEAD "training" and "assessment," above. The Massachusetts LEAD program intends "to develop and provide workshops for school board members and administrators who are hiring . . ."[75] The extent to which school districts will only hire people assessed and trained in these particular programs is not known, but Secretary of Education Bennett recommends in his Principal Selection Guide[76] the creation of a "pool of potential leaders" and the development of a "'pipeline' to the principalship."[77] While he admits that school districts can "collaborate with universities to frame courses," he also says that "A school system . . . should give its potential candidates training . . . enlist the aid of educational consultants . . . [and] initiate their own development programs."[78]

As a superintendent, I have felt the pressure from educational associations to "play the game." The school board association wants superintendents to send their board members to board member association training programs; the administrative associations want superintendents to send their administrators to administrative association training programs. And the payoff for doing all of this is a better job, where an "association" related selection consultant recommends those who have "played the game."[79]

LEAD Perspective on University Programs

All of this "coordination," of course, is not justified in terms of developing a "closed loop," but "necessitated" because of perceived and too often, real problems with university based educational administration programs. For example, the Delaware LEAD Director argues against university programs which are "too idealistic" and "not practical."[80] Both the California and Delaware LEAD officials point out that the day-to-day life of a principal does not include time for reflection and therefore principal training should be more realistic.

In the California LEAD application we read that:

> Studies of principals' work show it is characterized by "fragmentation, brevity, verbal (as opposed to written) communications, physical movement, one-on-one interactions, interruptions, and crisis." . . . In comparison of the work of graduate students with the work of principals . . . graduate training is dysfunctional. It does not prepare the principal for work characterized by a continuous series of brief, disjointed, verbal encounters with a variety of people seeking solutions or responses to a multitude of contingencies. Principals are frequently interrupted and often face situations demanding quick decisions.[11]

The Delaware LEAD application asks:

> What is different about job requirements and graduate course work? First, the workday is comprised of brief, disjointed verbal encounters with a variety of people on a diverse set of topics all of whom are seeking solutions or responses to a multitude of contingencies . . . School administrators are frequently interrupted and their problems often require quick decisions. By contrast, academic training is characterized by solitary, long-term, uninterrupted reading and writing on case studies. While academic seminars are informed by multiple perspectives on a topic, these situations do not have the exigencies of daily administrative jobs.[12]

Obviously these LEAD officials do not agree that uninterrupted prior study is a good way to prepare for decision making in an environment (like the emergency room in a hospital) where it is not possible to carefully research individual decisions at the time they need to be made.

Further, it seems contradictory to call for instructional leadership in more than the "mechanistic" and operational aspects of administering schools, and yet at the same time not recognize the need for creating a more thoughtful environment which values and allocates time for careful decision making.

The point is not that university educational administration programs are without fault; but rather that this alternative structure which is being created with LEAD funds, has even more serious problems. LEAD type "coordination" of recruitment, assessment, selection, and inservice may actually be discouraging and preventing educational ideals from being realized.

Conclusion

I hope LEAD programs will not encourage a new form of populist anti-intellectualism, but stimulate new cooperation and respect between professional associations, state departments of education, school districts and universities. Thus far that has been their greatest contribution.

If LEAD programs can also strengthen the public's vision of administrators and teachers as educational leaders, this potential impact should be applauded, because ultimately our reform efforts depend upon public understanding and approval.

On the other hand, administrators will never become respected educational leaders unless they value education themselves. Since LEAD sponsored NASSP Assessment Center procedures are based upon a validation study that accepts the finding that "range of interests, personal motivation, and educational values" are "generally not related to the performance dimensions" of a principal,[83] for this and other reasons mentioned above, additional research should precede further use of this assessment procedure in the selection of school administrators. Hopefully NASSP will form cooperative relationships with university educational administration faculty, encouraging them to pursue this research.

LEAD facilitation of the development of a closed loop involving insider recruitment, and specific training, assessment, selection and inservicing will neither foster the diversity which has been a strength of American education, nor will it help accomplish a professed LEAD goal of getting more women and minorities into administrative positions.[84]

The U.S. Department of Education should become more open and encouraging to researchers, rather than flaunt the Freedom of Information Act. It should recognize and support the ideals of higher education, rather than increasingly seek to subvert those ideals, creating alternate structures.

There is no quick LEAD training--no quick fix--one can take to become an educational leader. If America is to successfully compete with foreign competitors we need educational leaders who recognize academic excellence because they themselves have attained excellence in the arts and sciences, in addition to possessing a deep knowledge of the educational process. Administrative training in specific procedures is needed, but training is not a sufficient substitute for continued educational pursuits.[85] Similarly, maintaining the status quo through the development of colleagial relationships and peer coaching is necessary but not enough. To successfully compete in the global marketplace, we've got to continue building upon our great investment in education. We've got to become a learning society, transforming schools into

learning community centers and promoting greater--not fewer--ties between school districts and strengthened universities.

If the LEAD program is continued, funding should be so constructed to strengthen the research/teaching/service link between schools and colleges of education. Practicing teachers and administrators should be given more time to develop colleagial governance and reflective research, following the New York model. School districts should be given sufficient money to fund school/college of education demonstration projects. In strengthened institutions of higher education, teaching, research, and community service should build upon one another. One can't sustain teaching in higher education unless there is a base of research. And too much educational research will continue to be inapplicable unless it is informed by faculty engaged in teaching and school service.

While admittedly universities have their problems, their ideals promote this symbiotic relationship between teaching, research and service. This is not true of LEAD training programs which must now attempt to become self-supporting. The U.S. Department of Education has already cut the request for third year funding for LEAD programs in the very year that many (e.g., Arkansas) promised to get involved in research. Hence it is likely that little research will be pursued as these fledgling programs try to generate more income through teaching. In the meantime, university educational administration programs, which could be improved through subsidy derived from increased inservice offerings, lose this opportunity.

The question "Where does LEAD lead?" ultimately becomes equivalent to a central political question: Does education fit the market model, or is education based upon more fundamental values?

LEAD was founded upon the assumption that education is a product which may be governed by market forces.[86] While education may partially fit the market model, considering it a product ignores many critical problems.[87] Hence in the final analysis one must question the need for the creation of an auxilliary LEAD coordinating structure and ask whether available federal funding might be better channeled through state departments of education, professional associations, school districts, and colleges of education.[88]

NOTES

1. Telephone conversation with Bruce Hunter, June 17, 1988.

2. Bok, Derek, "The President's Report to the Harvard Board of Overseers for 1982-83," Harvard Magazine, May-June, 1984, p. 32-43, 70-71.

3. Johnston, Joseph (Ed.), Educating Managers: Executive Effectiveness Through Liberal Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1986.

4. Halberstam, David, The Best and the Brightest. New York: Random House, 1972.

5. Burns, James MacGregor, Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1978, p. 50.

6. Burns, p. 445.

7. Burns, p. 446-447.

8. Burns, p. 448.

9. Bok, Derek, Higher Learning. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1986, p. 84-85.

10. Kelley, Henry, et.al., Technology and the American Economic Transition: Choices For The Future. Washington, D.C.: Office of Technology Assessment, 1988.

11. Hoffert, Robert, "Education Faces 'Death By Whimper'," Chronicle of Higher Education, June 22, 1988, p. B3.

12. Jones, Edward and Gerard, Howard, Foundations of Social Psychology. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967, p. 227.

13. Peters, T.J. and Waterman, R.H., In Search of Excellence. New York: Harper & Row, 1982.

14. "Who's Excellent Now?" Business Week, 1984, p. 78.

15. Johnston, p. 21-22.

16. Burlingame, Martin, "Images of Leadership in Effective Schools Literature," in Greenfield, William (Ed.), Instructional Leadership: Concepts, Issues and Controversies. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1987, p. 3-16.

17. Telephone conversation with Bruce Hunter, June 17, 1988.

18. Application for Grants Under Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) Program, CFDA Number: 84.178, OMB No. 1850-0572, 5/87, p. 2.

19. The lack of support for research expenses and salaries in colleges of education is well known. Assistant principals earn as much as the average public university full professor of education. ($41,708 during the 1987-88 school year. Source: The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 6, 1988, p. A10.)

20. "Summary: Leadership in Educational Administration Development (LEAD) Information Conference," Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, October 28, 1986, p. 4.

21. "Summary," p. 2.

22. "Summary," p. 2.

23. Telephone conversation with Hunter Moorman, May 1988.

24. More than half of the LEAD projects promised to develop training materials or research summaries. However, over half of those projects had not produced such documents as promised by the summer of 1988. A few that had were unwilling to make them available to non-LEAD faculty. For example, the director of the Wisconsin LEAD project responded to my inquiry, as follows: "I am most interested in communicating and sharing with other LEAD people. However, at this point we do not have printed materials to share with you." (Letter from Johanna W. Kaufman, Director, Wisconsin LEAD, May 20, 1988.)

25. A few state LEAD projects are not involved in either training or education. For example, the Tennessee LEAD program is following the "agricultural experiment station model" (Tennessee LEAD application, p. 1) in establishing throughout the state centers to implement certain "priorities."

> Once projects are implemented at school sites, persons from nearby will be able to visit in order to see and become "believers" in school improvement activities that lead to improved pupil outcomes. (Tennessee LEAD application, Dec. 4, 1986, p. 1)

26. South Carolina LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 8.

27. South Carolina LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 8.

28. South Carolina LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 9.

29. South Carolina LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 22. Note: "PET" means "Performance Effectiveness Training."

30. Georgia LEAD application abstract, Dec. 1, 1986.

31. New Jersey LEAD application, Dec. 4, 1986, Sec. 4, p. 3.

32. California LEAD application, Dec. 1986, p. 2.

33. California LEAD application abstract, Dec. 1986. Note: It is interesting to note the degree to which these California training manuals are available. (Letter from California LEAD project director, Laraine Roberts, June 21, 1988) Each of the following comes with student materials and a "Trainer's Manual." "Instructional Leverage I, II, and III" cost $300 each. "Vision," "Organizational Culture," "Taking Stock," "Intervention Strategies," "Marshalling Resources," "Overcoming Resistance," "Monitoring and Adjusting," "Organizational Context I" and "Organizational Context II" cost $400 each. "Student Performance," "Mission & Goals," "Parental Involvement," "English/LA," "Math," "Social Studies," "Science," "Top Management Support I," "Top Management Support II," "Top Management Support III," "Follow-Through Support I," and "Follow-Through Support II" cost $500 each. And finally, "Strengthening Curriculum," "Instructional Strategies," "Professional Accountability," "School Climate," and "Professional Development" sell for $600 each. Shipping costs are extra!

34. Hawaii LEAD application, Dec. 3, 1986, p. 1-2.

35. Hawaii LEAD application, Dec. 3, 1986, p. 4.

36. In Alaska many administrators work in cross-cultural situations and administer very small schools where their responsibilities extend across subject-matter areas and beyond the confines of the classroom into the community. Principals may be required to "see to the physical and emotional health needs of an entire community." (Alaska LEAD application, Dec. 2, 1986, p. 5-6.) Given that situation, who would suspect that a University of Alaska, Fairbanks, survey of 70 school administrators would find "that what they needed most was training in effective teaching and effective schools." (Alaska LEAD application, Dec. 2, 1986, p. 7)

37. Pennsylvania LEAD application, 1986, p. 18.

38. Pennsylvania LEAD application, 1986, p. 21.

39. New York LEAD application, Dec. 1986, p. 22.

40. New York LEAD application, Dec. 1986, p. 24.

41. Idaho LEAD application abstract, Dec. 5, 1986.

42. Delaware LEAD application, Dec. 1, 1986, p. 4-6.

43. Pennsylvania LEAD application, 1986, p. 1.

44. Pennsylvania LEAD application, 1986, p. 44.

45. Pennsylvania LEAD application, 1986, p. 18.

46. Pennsylvania LEAD application, 1986, p. 21.

47. Pennsylvania LEAD application, 1986, p. 3.

48. Missouri LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 5.

49. Connecticut LEAD application, 1986, p. 13.

50. South Dakota LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 5.

51. Rhode Island LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 6-7.

52. Bennis, Warren and Nanus, Burt, Leaders: The Strategies For Taking Charge. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

53. Florida LEAD application, 1986, p. 27.

54. Twenty-nine programs promised, in their LEAD applications, to make available written research reports or LEAD developed curriculum materials. Upon written requests and in some cases the payment of fees, I was only able to obtain those documents from 35% of those projects.

55. Louisiana LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 11-12.

56. "Searching For Excellence," Washington, D.C.: NASSP, unspecified date.

57. Gousha, et.al., "Administrators Join Revolution in Professional Standards," The School Administrator, 44, No. 2, 1987, p. 10-12.

58. South Carolina Code Ann., Ch. 24, Article 59-24-10 (1984).

59. "Searching For Excellence."

60. Schmitt, Neal, et.al., Criterion-Related and Content Validity of the NASSP Assessment Center. Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan: NASSP, unspecified date.

61. Schmitt, p. 27.

62. Andrews, Richard and Soder, Roger, "Principal Leadership and Student Achievement," Educational Leadership, Vol. 44, March 1987, p. 9-11.

63. "Searching For Excellence."

64. Schmitt, p. 50.

65. Bass, Bernard, Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership. London: The Free Press, 1981.

66. Burns, 1978.

67. Schmitt, p. 35.

68. Schmitt, p. 35, also p. 33 and 64.

69. Schmitt, p. 33.

70. Telephone conversation with Alaska LEAD officials, June 1988.

71. Minnesota LEAD application, Dec. 3, 1986, p. 11-12.

72. Maine LEAD application, Dec. 3, 1986, p. 22.

73. Missouri LEAD application, Dec. 5, 1986, p. 16.

74. Telephone conversation with Kansas LEAD officials, June 1988.

75. Massachusetts LEAD application, Dec. 4, 1986, p. 14.

76. Bennett, William, Principal Selection Guide. Washington, D.C.: Superintendent of Public Documents, June 1987.

77. Bennett, p. 16.

78. Bennett, p. 16.

79. Wildman, Louis, "Should A School Board Hire A Search Consultant?" The American School Board Journal, February 1988.

80. Telephone conversation with Delaware LEAD Director, Mary Ketchem, June 1988.

81. California LEAD application, Dec. 1986, p. 4-5.

82. Delaware LEAD application, Dec. 1, 1986, p. 8.

83. Schmitt, p. 35, also p. 33 and 64.

84. The NASSP assessment procedure should be further examined to determine the extent to which it discriminates on the basis of sex and race. According to the their research summary, there are significant effects for candiate sex on some of the concensus skill ratings. Significant differences between male and female candidates are observed on Judgement, Educational Values, Oral Communication, and Written Communication. Without exception, female candidates received higher consensus ratings than male candidates on those dimensions . . . White candidates received significantly higher mean consensus ratings than non-white candiates on Problem Analysis, Judgement, Decisiveness, Leadership, Written Communications, Organizational Ability and the placement recommendation. (Schmitt, p. 11)

85. The inservice education of educational aministrators should be broadened. Workshops on "the characteristics of effective schools" or on "how to improve public relations" are not bad; they are simply insufficient. A seminar involving community representatives and school administrators centered around books such as Technology and American Transition: Choices for the Future, recently issued by eight committees of Congress, would represent a much more adequate program, for example. (Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1988)

86. LEAD is built upon the market model. As Mary Ketchem, Director of the Delaware LEAD program said in an interview:

> We're marketing a product. If the university product is not selling, maybe that should tell the universities something.

My follow-up question to her comment was: "But is a course good just because it is popular?" Her answer:

> I don't have time to think about such things. Maybe if I had two or three weeks, I could reflect on that and give you a good answer. [But] You've got to give the principals credit for being able to choose what they want.

Therein lies the central confrontation between the ideals of higher education and the foundation of the LEAD program.

87. Private consultants with various proprietary interests threaten the free flow of ideas which many of us take to be fundamental to the educational process. Private consultants forced to seek funding in the marketplace can't afford to maintain that critical independent objectivity which their client school districts need, because they cannot risk offending their clientele. Even for universities it is very difficult to increase standards when another group is offering ostensibly the same program, but not requiring nearly so much.

88. An analysis of the evaluation plans for these LEAD programs would make a study in itself. Most simply involve an inquiry into whether the applicant did what was planned, as examined by a private consultant chosen by the grantee.

Appendix

Evidence of the need to broaden the education of educational administrators comes from many sources. Consider the findings of an M.I.T. Faculty Commission on Industrial Productivity (Technology Review. May/June 1988). That commission has been studying the steps that M.I.T. and other educational institutions must take to restore industrial competitiveness and productivity growth. The commission studied the recent histories of eight industrial sectors--semiconductors and computers, automobiles, steel, consumer electronics, chemicals and pharmaceuticals, textiles, machine tools, and commercial aircraft. It found six common, recurring weaknesses. I have added their educational "analogies" in brackets:

1. Short time horizons, and a tendency to overemphasize short-term financial goals. [The effective schools trainers seek to raise achievement test scores, emphasizing expository instruction, forgetting that most important learning takes place within the investigatory mode.]

2. Parochialism in management decision-making, frequently leading to inadequate attention to foreign markets and overseas competition. [In educational administration there is a heavy emphasis upon narrow training, coupled with an open antagonism toward broader, liberal education. Practitioners demand practical training that will help them do their job today.]

3. Artificial barriers within and between firms. These have prevented teamwork and fostered inefficiency. [Team teaching and interdisciplinary studies are virtually non-existant within secondary schools.]

4. The typical Japanese firm thinks of itself as "an alliance of workers, managers, and investors." That doesn't happen in the United States. [Administrators and faculty have not been encouraged to work together as colleagues in pursuit of the world of ideas. Faculty teach their classes and do not feel part of a "faculty" continuing the life-long pursuit of knowledge. Administrators are consumed by the managerial task of keeping the schools running smoothly. The vision of fostering a learning community is not even on the horizon.]

5. Poor use and planning of human resources. Firms have tended to view labor more as a cost factor to be minimized than as a productive, evolving resource. [Teacher evaluation is increasingly based upon a mechanistic conception of teachers as laborers rather than as professionals. Staff selection is increasingly and exclusively based upon filling the pre-defined needs of the school, rather than upon a conception of a position partly as an opportunity to subsidize the self-defined work of an educator.]

6. Weaknesses in technological practice that have either prevented exploitation of new technology or compromised the quality of products based on it. [Whereas schools should be conducting expository instruction through the use of educational technology by now, in fact, students spend more time watching largely worthless (or outright anti-intellectual) television at home than they do going to school.]

Notice that problems 1-5 will never be altered through managerial training. Their resolution requires leaders with a broader perspective.